UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CR 14-50068

Plaintiff,

VS.

DEFENDANT'S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM

PHILLIP HOLDEN,

Defendant.

Comes now Phillip Holden, the Defendant in the above-titled matter, by and through his attorney, Assistant Federal Public Defender Erin S. Bolinger, and moves the Court for a reasonable sentence consistent with the terms of the plea agreement as set forth in the Presentence Investigation Report (PSR). Holden files this sentencing memorandum in support of his specific sentencing request. This motion is made pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). This memorandum is made pursuant to the United States Supreme Court decisions in *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), *Rita v. United States*, 551 U.S. 338 (2007), and *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38 (2007), and is respectfully submitted in order to provide information to assist the Court in fashioning a sentence "sufficient but not greater than necessary" to achieve the statutory purposes of punishment, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

FACTS

A. Offense Related Facts.

The relevant facts of this offense are set forth in the PSR. Holden certainly understands that his actions were wrong. He believes that had he not been drinking he never would have

found himself in this situation. As the PSR indicates, this plea agreement contemplates the

resolution of a case pending in Nebraska as well.

В. General Facts about Defendant.

Mr. Holden was raised in a stable, close home. However, in 2008 his parents divorced

and this break-up caused Mr. Holden a significant amount of stress, sadness, and anxiety. His

life became much more difficult after the upheaval in his family, and he experienced bouts of

depression and anxiety. He moved several times during the years after his parents' divorce and

began abusing drugs and alcohol. The year prior to his recent arrest, Mr. Holden had been

getting back on track. He was planning on attending college in the fall and had been employed,

working on paying off debt, and had been making positive emotional growth. Obviously, this

progress has been stymied by his arrest last August. However, he remains very close to his

family, specifically his sisters, and receives emotional support while incarcerated from a number

of other family members.

Mr. Holden voluntarily participated in a psychosexual evaluation. His scores were in the

non-problematic range for the Cognitive Distortion and Social Desirability scales. As the

evaluation reports, Mr. Holden is not considered to be a danger to others, and he is also

considered to be a low-risk to re-offend.

ARGUMENT & AUTHORITIES

Sentencing today should be a process where the Court is concerned with treating each

person who appears for sentencing as a unique individual, deserving of a sentence carefully

United States v. Phillip D. Holden

CR 14-50068

Defendant's Sentencing Memorandum

June 24, 2015

Page 2

crafted to recognize their personal circumstances, their offense, and statutory goals of sentencing. This process is possible now, more than ever in the federal system in light of the Supreme

Court's decisions in *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), *Rita v. United States*, 551

U.S. 338 (2007), Cunningham v. California, 549 U.S. 270 (2007), and Gall v. United States, 552

U.S. 38 (2007).

Proper Sentence Under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)

Section 3553(a) directs sentencing courts to consider (1) the nature and circumstances of

the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; (2) the kinds of sentences

available; (3) the sentencing range established by the guidelines; (4) any pertinent policy

statement issued by the Sentencing Commission; (5) the need to avoid unwarranted

sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of

similar conduct; and (6) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

Mr. Holden agreed to a joint recommendation for a 12-year prison sentence. The original

charge Mr. Holden faced would have required a mandatory minimum sentence of 15 years. The

nature of the offense outlined in the PSR, as well as the plea agreement, was reached by the

Assistant U.S. Attorney and the Defendant.

This case presents a serious law violation, as all felony offenses do. However, there is no

actual victim in this matter as this was part of a law enforcement sting. Holden took immediate

responsibility for his actions and did not resist law enforcement at the time of his arrest.

United States v. Phillip D. Holden

Case 5:14-cr-50068-JLV Document 52 Filed 06/24/15 Page 4 of 5 PageID #: 147

It is clear that Holden understands the seriousness of his offense. His time in jail already

has impressed upon him the wrongfulness of his conduct, and he has expressed remorse. He

hopes to use his term of incarceration and supervision to take advantage of any resources offered,

specifically, any employment training. Obviously, it is important for him to learn new skills so

that he may provide for himself when he is released from prison.

Holden's advisory guideline range as set forth in the PSR is 1. In reaching the plea

agreement, the parties did not contemplate the guideline range as calculated in the PSR. Rather,

the negotiations determined that the 12-year term agreed upon was appropriate based on the

Defendant's criminal history and the potential 15-year mandatory minimum he was facing here

and another federal sentence in Nebraska.

CONCLUSION

Holden requests that the Court provide him a sentence consistent with his plea agreement

of 12 years, followed by a reasonable term of supervised release. For all of the reasons set forth

herein above, a sentence of that nature is reasonable. The Court can fashion such a sentence that

promotes the goals of sentencing consistent with the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)

which will result in a sentence "sufficient but not greater than necessary" to achieve the statutory

purposes of punishment.

United States v. Phillip D. Holden

Dated this 24th of June, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

NEIL FULTON Federal Public Defender By:

/s/ Erin S. Bolinger

Erin S. Bolinger, Assistant Federal Public Defender Attorney for Defendant Office of the Federal Public Defender Districts of South Dakota and North Dakota 703 Main Street, Second Floor Rapid City, SD 57701 Telephone: 605-343-5110; Facsimile: 605-343-1498 filinguser SDND@fd.org